

-2-

REMARKS

Claims 1-44 are pending in the application. All claims stand rejected. The prior art rejections are traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on UK 2,289,555 to Wilska et al. in view of US 5,436,635 to Takahara et al.

The Applicants' docking system, as recited in amended Claims 1, 21, 30, and 35, includes a matrix display, a power management circuit that controls the power consumption of a control circuit that actuates the pixel electrodes to present an image on the display, and a light source that illuminates the image. After the image has been illuminated, the power management circuit lowers the power consumption of the control circuit until display data for the next image is ready to be generated by the control circuit and written to the matrix display. Accordingly, the power management circuit lowers the power consumption of the control circuit between sequentially generated display data. By lowering the power consumption of the control circuit between the writing of images, the power management circuit has the advantageous feature of lengthening the lifetime of the batteries or energy source used to power the display.

Wilska, alone or in combination with Takahara, does not teach or suggest a docking system with such features, in particular, "a power management circuit that lowers the power consumption of the control circuit after the image is illuminated until display data for the next image from the control circuit is ready to be presented to the matrix display, the power consumption of the control circuit being lowered between sequentially generated display data," as required by the claims. (See Claims 1, 21, 30 and 35.)

Wilska discusses, as illustrated in its Figures 1-3, a device for personal communication, data collection, and processing. The device includes a housing (1) which encloses a data processing unit (2) that connects to a cellular telephone (17) with a mobile controller (8). The

-3-

device also includes a display (9) mounted to the housing (1) for displaying images to a user of the device.

We agree with the Office Action that Takahara, unlike Wilska, discusses an active matrix liquid crystal display with a light source. Such a system is said to be usable as a view finder.

Neither Takahara nor Wilska, however, mention the claimed power management circuit that controls the power consumption of the control circuit, as recited in independent Claims 1, 21, 30, and 35. Furthermore, neither reference discusses lengthening the lifetime of an energy source used to power the display, which is a particular advantage of the Applicants' power management circuit. Without such an advantage, there is no motivation to include the Applicants' power management circuit in Wilska's nor Takahara's devices.

To address the power management circuit limitations, the Office Action points to Figure 22 of Takahara. In particular, the Office Action relies on the light emitting tube power supply circuit function block (223) and the reproduction circuit function block (225). Those function blocks are discussed at column 31, lines 16-63 of Takahara.

As described by Takahara, the quantity of light emitted by the light emitting tube (211) is varied in proportion to the pulse width to reduce power consumption. That is apparently accomplished by manually rotating a variable resistor. That is not the same as lowering the power consumption of a control circuit "between sequentially generated display data" as claimed by the Applicants.

Without a power management circuit that lowers the power consumption of the control circuit after an image has been presented until display data for the next image from the control circuit is ready to be presented, Wilska's device, alone or in combination with the teachings of Takahara, cannot include the claimed display with a control circuit and power management circuit that lowers the power consumption of the control circuit between sequentially generated display data, as required by the claims.

-4-

Because the other claims depend from Claims 1, 21, 30, or 35, the reasons for allowance of Claims 1, 21, 30, and 35 apply as well to the dependent claims. Thus, Wilska, in combination with Takahara do not make obvious the invention described in Claims 1-44.

Reconsideration of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Regarding Double Patenting


Claims 1-44 have been provisionally rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of double patenting based on Claims 1-28 of co-pending Application No. 08/766,607. The Applicants wish to place this rejection in abeyance until the claims are finalized. If appropriate at that time, a Terminal Disclaimer will be filed to obviate this rejection once the claims are otherwise allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
Rodney D. Johnson
Registration No. 36,558
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: July 29, 2003